UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/685,192	10/14/2003	Duncan L. Mewherter	LOT9-2003-0025-US1 (010)	4172

46321 7590 10/31/2006	EXAMINER	
CAREY, RODRIGUEZ, GREENBERG & PAUL, LLP	BOTTS, MICHAEL K	
STEVEN M. GREENBERG		
950 PENINSULA CORPORATE CIRCLE	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 3020	2176	
BOCA RATON, FL 33487		

DATE MAILED: 10/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael K. Botts	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>*18 August 2006*</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This is a Final Office Action on the merits.   This action is responsive to the

following communication: Amendment, which was filed on August 18, 2006.

2.   Claims 1-22 are currently pending in the case, with claims 1, 6, and 16 being the

independent claims.

3.   Claims 1-22 are rejected.

Claims Rejection – 35 U.S.C. 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   **Claims 1-4, 6-14, and 16-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being**

unpatentable over Estrada, et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication, published

October 17, 2003, and filed December 29, 2000.) [hereinafter "Estrada"], in view of

DzSoft, "Turn PowerPoint presentations into standalone Slide Shows," published

on the Internet at least as of October 1, 2003, downloaded by the Examiner on

May 14, 2006 from:

http://web.archiv.org/web/20031001171832/dzsoft.com/dzshow-powerpoint.htm,

downloaded pages 1-2, with additional pages 3-4, being printouts of the text

frames appearing on pages 1-2, [hereinafter "DzSoft"].

Regarding **independent claim 1**, Estrada in view of DzSoft teaches:

A system for converting slide show presentations for use within non-presentation applications, the system comprising:

a slide show produced by a slide show presentation application and stored in a native format; and,

a slide show conversion process configured for coupling to a non-presentation application and programmed both to extract contextual data from said slide show in its native format, and also to convert associated slides in said slide show to raster imagery for use in said non-presentation application.

(It is noted that "contextual data" is not specifically defined in the specification except by examples, which include "The contextual data can include a slide title for each one of the associated slides." See, disclosure, page 4. DzSoft teaches that the slide titles are extracted in the export from PowerPoint to DzSoft. See, DzSoft, page 1, center of the page, detailing how to re-order the slides based on the original titles, such as Slide1, Slide2, etc.

Estrada teaches to convert a slide show file, specifically in PowerPoint 97, and to convert it to a markup language, specifically HTML. See, Estrada, paragraphs [0350]-[0352]. Estrada does not expressly teach extracting contextual data from the slide show in its native format.

DzSoft teaches contextual data in the form of frame identification, and further, teaches adding annotations to a slide. See, DzSoft, pages 1-4.

Estrada and DzSoft are combinable in that they involve the same art of manipulation and conversion of slide show images and text to convert the native slide show slides into a format that is viable outside the originating program.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Estrada and DzSoft.

The suggestion or motivation for combining Estrada and DzSoft is that both references have as their goal for the obvious and beneficial purpose of creating a stand alone slide show in a commonly accessible and sharable format, such as JPEG or HTML.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Estrada and DzSoft to created the invention specified in claim 1.)

Regarding **dependent claim 2**, Estrada in view of DzSoft teaches:

> *The system of claim 1, wherein said contextual data comprises a slide title for each one of said associated slides.*

(The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, DzSoft, pages 3-4 teaching assignment of slide titles.)

Regarding **dependent claim 3**, DzSoft teaches:

> *The system of claim 1, wherein said contextual data comprises important text associated with each one of said associated slides.*

(The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, DzSoft,

page 4 teaching captions to identify slides in picture shows.)

Regarding **dependent claim 4**, Estrada in view of DzSoft teaches:

> *The system of claim 1, wherein said slide show conversion process further*
>
> *comprises programming for generating a markup language document and for*
>
> *disposing said contextual data and said raster imagery within said markup*
>
> *language document.*

(The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Estrada

teaching to convert a slide show file, specifically in PowerPoint 97, and to convert it to a

markup language, specifically HTML. See, Estrada, paragraphs [0350]-[0352].)

Regarding **independent claim 6**, Estrada in view of DzSoft teaches:

> *A method for converting a slide show presentation for use within a non-*
>
> *presentation application, the method comprising the steps of:*
>
> *extracting a slide title for a first slide in the slide show presentation;*
>
> *converting said first slide into a raster image;*
>
> *disposing both said slide title and said raster image in a markup language*
>
> *document; and,*
>
> *repeating said extracting, converting and disposing steps for a selected*
>
> *group of other slides in the slide show presentation.*

(It is noted that "contextual data" is not specifically defined in the specification except by

examples, which include "The contextual data can include a slide title for each one of the associated slides." See, disclosure, page 4. DzSoft teaches that the slide titles are extracted in the export from PowerPoint to DzSoft. See, DzSoft, page 1, center of the page, detailing how to re-order the slides based on the original titles, such as Slide1, Slide2, etc.

Estrada teaches to convert a slide show file, specifically in PowerPoint 97, and to convert it to a markup language, specifically HTML. See, Estrada, paragraphs [0350]-[0352]. Estrada does not expressly teach extracting contextual data from the slide show in its native format.

DzSoft teaches contextual data in the form of frame identification, and further, teaches adding annotations to a slide. See, DzSoft, pages 1-4.

Estrada and DzSoft are combinable in that they involve the same art of manipulation and conversion of slide show images and text to convert the native slide show slides into a format that is viable outside the originating program.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have repeated the conversion process for additional slides in the slide show presentation for the obvious and beneficial purpose of converting the a plurality or all of the slide show in order to make it available for use for devices that did not have the original program installed.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Estrada and DzSoft.

The suggestion or motivation for combining Estrada and DzSoft is that both references have as their goal for the obvious and beneficial purpose of creating a stand alone slide show in a commonly accessible and sharable format, such as JPEG or HTML.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Estrada and DzSoft to created the invention specified in claim 6.)

Regarding **dependent claim 7**, Estrada in view of DzSoft teaches:

> *The method of claim 6, further comprising the steps of:*
>
> *further extracting important text from said first slide;*
>
> *annotating said raster image of said first slide in said markup language document with said extracted important text; and,*
>
> *further repeating said repeating, further extracting and annotating steps for a selected group of other slides in the slide show presentation.*

(The rejection of claim 6 is incorporated herein by this reference. DzSoft teaches annotation to the slides, but does not expressly teach extracting "important" text. See, DzSoft, page 2.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to extract "important" text from slides such as text representative of the text on the slide for the obvious and beneficial purposes of indexing the slides, providing hints to the user of the contents of

the slides, and creating a table of contents, such as is a standard function in PowerPoint 97.

It would also have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have repeated the annotation steps for the obvious and beneficial purpose of examining a plurality or all of the slides in the set.)

Regarding **dependent claim 8**, Estrada in view of DzSoft teaches:

> *The method of claim 6, wherein said further extracting step comprises the step of further extracting text having formatting characteristics within said first slide which emphasizes said text.*

(The rejection of claim 6 is incorporated herein by this reference. DzSoft teaches annotation to the slides, but does not expressly teach extracting text based on formatting characteristics. See, DzSoft, page 2.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to extract "important" text from slides such as text representative of the text on the slide for the obvious and beneficial purposes of indexing the slides, providing hints to the user of the contents of the slides, and creating a table of contents.)

Regarding **dependent claim 9**, Estrada in view of DzSoft teaches: .

> *The method of claim 8, wherein said formatting characteristics comprise a point size which exceeds a threshold value.*

(The rejection of claim 6 is incorporated herein by this reference. DzSoft teaches annotation to the slides, but does not expressly teach extracting text based on formatting characteristics, including point size. See, DzSoft, page 2.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to extract "important" text from slides such as text representative of the text on the slide for the obvious and beneficial purposes of indexing the slides, providing hints to the user of the contents of the slides, and creating a table of contents.)

Regarding **dependent claim 10**, Estrada in view of DzSoft teaches:

> *The method of claim 7, wherein said annotating step comprises the step of generating an ALT tag with said important text in association with said raster image in said markup language document.*

(The rejection of claim 6 is incorporated herein by this reference. DzSoft teaches annotation to the slides, but does not expressly teach associating an ALT tag with important text. See, DzSoft, page 2.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to associate an ALT tag with important text to identify the content of the slide. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use an ALT tag for the purpose, in that such use was one of the reasons the ALT tag was developed for HTLM. See, e.g.: Graham, "XHTML 1.0 Language and Design Sourcebook, The Next Generation of HTML," Wiley Computer Publishing, copyright 2000, page 249, stating: *"Good design should make allowances for users who do not see the images, either*

because they are using a text-only browser or because they have disabled image

loading on their browsers. The alt attribute lets you provide a text alternative to and

description for the image,· useful in either of these instances.")

Regarding **dependent claim 11**, Estrada in view of DzSoft teaches:

> *The method of claim 10, wherein said generating step further comprises*
>
> *the step of formatting said ALT tag with additional inline indicators for facilitating*
>
> *an audible playback of said important text in a non-presentation application.*

(The rejection of claim 6 is incorporated herein by this reference. DzSoft teaches

annotation to the slides, but does not expressly teach associating an ALT tag with

important text. See, DzSoft, page 2.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to associate an ALT

tag with important text to identify the content of the slide. It would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use an ALT tag for the

purpose, in that such use was one of the reasons the ALT tag was developed for HTLM.

See, e.g.: Graham, "XHTML 1.0 Language and Design Sourcebook, The Next

Generation of HTML," Wiley Computer Publishing, copyright 2000, page 249, stating:

"Good design should make allowances for users who do not see the images, either

because they are using a text-only browser or because they have disabled image

loading on their browsers. The alt attribute lets you provide a text alternative to and

description for the image, useful in either of these instances."

Just as it would have been obvious to leave a string of text in ALT to describe a missing image, so would it have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to leave a string of text describing a missing audio clip.)

Regarding **dependent claim 12**, Estrada in view of DzSoft teaches:

> *The method of claim 6, further comprising the step of processing said markup language document in a non-presentation application.*

(The rejection of claim 6 is incorporated herein by this reference. See in particular, Estrada, paragraphs [0350]-[0352], teaching the processing of the markup language document in the non-presentation application of QuickPlace.)

Regarding **dependent claim 13**, Estrada in view of DzSoft teaches:

> *The method of claim 12, wherein said processing step comprises the step of generating an agenda with each slide title for each raster image in said markup language document.*

(The rejection of claim 6 is incorporated herein by this reference. See in particular, Estrada, paragraphs [0110]-[0162], teaching folder objects with tables of contents and indexes.)

Regarding **dependent claim 14**, Estrada in view of DzSoft teaches:

> *The method of claim 6, further comprising the step of performing each of*
> *said extracting, disposing, converting and repeating steps in externally to a slide*
> *show presentation application which produced the slide show presentation.*

(The rejection of claim 6 is incorporated herein by this reference. See in particular,
Estrada, paragraphs [0001]-[0552], teaching performing extracting, disposing,
converting, and repeating the steps externally in the program QuickPlace.)

Regarding **independent claim 16**, Estrada in view of DzSoft teaches:

> *A machine readable storage having stored thereon a computer program*
> *for converting a slide show presentation for use within a non-presentation*
> *application, the computer program comprising a routine set of instructions for*
> *causing the machine to perform the steps of:*
>
> > *extracting a slide title for a first slide in the slide show presentation;*
> >
> > *converting said first slide into a raster image;*
> >
> > *disposing both said slide title and said raster image in a markup language*
> *document; and,*
> >
> > *repeating said extracting, converting and disposing steps for a selected*
> *group of other slides in the slide show presentation.*

(Claim 16 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1 and is
rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 17**, Estrada in view of DzSoft teaches:

The machine readable storage of claim 16, further comprising the steps of:

further extracting important text from said first slide;

annotating said raster image of said first slide in said markup language

document with said extracted important text; and,

further repeating said repeating, further extracting and annotating steps for

a selected group of other slides in the slide show presentation.

(The rejection of claim 16 is incorporated herein by this reference. It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to repeat the steps

in order to convert a plurality or all of the slides to be converted.)

Regarding **dependent claim 18**, Estrada in view of DzSoft teaches:

The machine readable storage of claim 17, wherein said further extracting

step comprises the step of further extracting text having formatting characteristics

within said first slide which emphasizes said text.

(Claim 18 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 8 and is

rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 19**, Estrada in view of DzSoft teaches:

The machine readable storage of claim 18, wherein said formatting

characteristics comprise a point size which exceeds a threshold value.

(Claim 19 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 9 and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 20**, Estrada in view of DzSoft teaches:

> *The machine readable storage of claim 17, wherein said annotating step comprises the step of generating an ALT tag with said important text in association with said raster image in said markup language document.*

(Claim 20 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 10 and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 21**, Estrada in view of DzSoft teaches:

> *The machine readable storage of claim 20, wherein said generating step further comprises the step of formatting said ALT tag with additional inline indicators for facilitating an audible playback of said important text in a non-presentation application.*

(Claim 21 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 11 and is rejected along the same rationale.)

5. **Claims 5, 15, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Estrada in view of DzSoft, and further in view of Mendhekar, et al. (U.S. Patent 6,108,696, issued August 22, 2000) [hereinafter "Mendhekar"].**

Regarding **dependent claim 5**, Estrada in view of DzSoft and further in view of

Mendhekar teaches:

>   *The system of claim 1, wherein said slide show conversion process further*
>
>   *comprises programming for reducing said raster imagery to a size suitable for*
>
>   *display in a pervasive device.*

(Estrada in view of DzSoft teaches the limitations of claim 1, but does not expressly

teach the reducing raster imagery to a size suitable for display in a pervasive device.

Mendhekar teaches converting a general purpose markup output, such as HTML,

to a device-dependent, "pervasive," device. See, Mendhekar, col. 1, line 7 through col.

4, line 6.

Estrada and DzSoft and Mendhekar are combinable in that they involve the same

art of conversion or modification of electronic documents for presentation.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to combine the teachings of Estrada and DzSoft with the teachings of

Mendhekar for the obvious benefit of presenting the converted slide show slides on

pervasive devices, such as PDA's.

The suggestion or motivation for combining the references is drawn from the

purpose of the conversion, which was to make the slide show data available to other

devices which did not have the native program installed.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention to combine the teachings of Estrada and DzSoft with the teachings

of Mendhekar to result in an invention as specified in claim 5.)

Regarding **dependent claim 15**, Estrada in view of DzSoft and further in view of

Mendhekar teaches:

> *The method of claim 6, further comprising the steps of:*
>
> *reducing said raster image to a size suitable for display in a pervasive*
>
> *device; and,*
>
> *rendering said slide title and said reduced raster image in a pervasive*
>
> *device display.*

(Estrada in view of DzSoft teaches the limitations of claim 6, but does not expressly

teach the reducing raster imagery to a size suitable for display in a pervasive device.

Mendhekar teaches converting a general purpose markup output, such as HTML,

to a device-dependent, "pervasive," device. See, Mendhekar, col. 1, line 7 through col.

4, line 6.

Estrada and DzSoft and Mendhekar are combinable in that they involve the same

art of conversion or modification of electronic documents for presentation.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to combine the teachings of Estrada and DzSoft with the teachings of

Mendhekar for the obvious benefit of presenting the converted slide show slides on

pervasive devices, such as PDA's.

The suggestion or motivation for combining the references is drawn from the purpose of the conversion, which was to make the slide show data available to other devices which did not have the native program installed.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Estrada and DzSoft with the teachings of Mendhekar to result in an invention as specified in claim 15.)

Regarding **dependent claim 22**, Estrada in view of DzSoft and further in view of Mendhekar teaches:

> *The machine readable storage of claim 17, further comprising the steps of:*
>
> *reducing said raster image to a size suitable for display in a pervasive device;*
>
> *and, rendering said slide title and said reduced raster image in a pervasive*
>
> *device display.*

(Estrada in view of DzSoft teaches the limitations of claim 17, but does not expressly teach the reducing raster imagery to a size suitable for display in a pervasive device.

Mendhekar teaches converting a general purpose markup output, such as HTML, to a device-dependent, "pervasive," device. See, Mendhekar, col. 1, line 7 through col. 4, line 6.

Estrada and DzSoft and Mendhekar are combinable in that they involve the same art of conversion or modification of electronic documents for presentation.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Estrada and DzSoft with the teachings of

Mendhekar for the obvious benefit of presenting the converted slide show slides on pervasive devices, such as PDA's.

The suggestion or motivation for combining the references is drawn from the purpose of the conversion, which was to make the slide show data available to other devices which did not have the native program installed.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Estrada and DzSoft with the teachings of Mendhekar to result in an invention as specified in claim 22.)

6.   It is noted that any citations to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. See, MPEP 2123.

Response to Arguments

Applicants' arguments filed August 18, 2006 have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive.

Regarding rejections of claims 1, 6, and 16:

Applicants argue that the reference DzSoft fails to teach the "extraction of contextual data from the slide show (in its native format)." See, Amendment, page 8.

The Examiner disagrees.

It is noted that "contextual data" is not specifically defined in the specification except by examples, which include "The contextual data can include a slide title for each one of the associated slides." See, disclosure, page 4.

DzSoft teaches that the slide titles are extracted in the export from PowerPoint to DzSoft. See, DzSoft, page 1, center of the page, detailing how to re-order the slides based on the original titles, such as Slide1, Slide2, etc.

Additional Prior Art

7.   The following prior art is made of record and not relied upon that is considered pertinent to applicants' disclosure:

DzSoft Slide Show, home page, downloaded by the Examiner on 10/30/06 from: http://web.archive.org/web/20020610034346/dzsoft.com/dzshow.htm, teaching text associated with an image in the screenshot of the city, with the web site appearing in the lower right hand corner of the image.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS for the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action.   In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Michael K. Botts whose telephone number is 571-272-

5533.   The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:00-4:00

EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136.   The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system.   Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MKB/mkb

WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER